arXiv:math/9804070v1 [math.CA] 14 Apr 1998

On the existence of doubling measures with certain regularity properties

Per Bylund Jaume Gudayol*

xx March 1998

Abstract

Given a compact pseudo-metric space, we associate to it upper and lower dimensions, depending only on the metric. Then we construct a doubling measure for which the measure of a dilated ball is closely related to these dimensions.

1 Introduction

Let (X, ρ) be a compact complete metric space. Suppose that (X, ρ) is homogeneous. This means that there exists a so-called doubling measure μ supported by X, i.e. there is a constant c such that for any $x \in X$ and any $R > 0$

$$\mu(B(x, 2R)) \leq c\mu(B(x, R)). \tag{1}$$

In 1984, Dynkin ([Dyn,84]) proved that for certain subsets E of the unit sphere $\mathbb{T} \subset \mathbb{C}$ there exists a doubling measure on E. In the same paper Dynkin conjectured that any compact $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is homogeneous. This conjecture was proved by Volberg and Konyagin ([V-K,88]) by using a dimension first defined in [Lar,67] under the name of uniform metric dimension, in this paper denoted by $\Upsilon(E)$ (note that $\Upsilon(\mathbb{R}^n) = n$ in the Euclidean case). More precisely, Volberg and Konyagin proved that (X, ρ) is homogeneous if and only if there is some $\gamma < \infty$ such that any ball $B(x, kR)$ contains at most Ck^γ

*Partially supported by MEC grant PB95-0956-C02-01 and CIRIT grant GRQ94-2014.

points separated from each other by a distance of at least R. The uniform metric dimension $\Upsilon(X,\rho)$ is then defined as the infimum of such γ. Furthermore, given $\gamma < \infty$ in the condition above Volberg and Konyagin proved that for any $s > \gamma$ there exists a measure μ such that, for $0 < R \leq kR \leq 1$,

$$\mu(B(x,kR)) \leq C_1 k^s \mu(B(x,R)) \tag{2}$$

Clearly, any measure satisfying 2 is a doubling measure, and conversely, iterating 1 one gets 2 with $s = \log_2 c$. In particular, Volberg and Konyagin proved Dynkin's conjecture by showing that on any compact $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ there exists a measure μ satisfying 2 with $s = n$ (in the maximum metric).

In this paper we generalize the proof of Volberg and Konyagin to the pseudo-metric case by showing the existence of a measure μ not only satisfying the upper bound condition 2, but also the following analogous lower bound condition: Suppose there is a $\delta \geq 0$ such that any ball $B(x,kR)$ contains at least Ck^δ points separated from each other by a distance of at least R. Then for any $t < \delta$ there exists a measure μ such that, for $0 < R \leq kR \leq 1$,

$$C_2 k^t \mu(B(x,R)) \leq \mu(B(x,kR)) \tag{3}$$

Note that 3 is trivially true for $t = 0$.

Jonsson and Wallin in [J-W,84] gave a thorough study of function spaces on s-sets. By definition, an s-measure fulfils both 2 and 3 in the special case when $s = t$. An s-set is a set on which there exists an s-measure, which then may be taken as the s-dimensional Hausdorff measure. These sets are also called Ahlfors-regular sets.

Measures satisfying both 2 and 3 in the general case when $t \leq s$ were first considered by Jonsson ([Jon,94]) when studying interpolation sets for Besov spaces on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

The authors of this paper, independently of each other, also studied such measures in [Byl,94] and [Gud,97]. Each of these works contains the main result of this paper, in [Byl,94] formulated for Euclidean spaces and in [Gud,97] for metric spaces. However, in this paper our result has been restated in terms of pseudo-metric spaces as we believe there are some applications to this more general case.

2 Definitions and statements of results

In what follows we denote by (X, d) a complete locally compact pseudo-metric space. We say that $d : X \times X \mapsto [0, +\infty)$ is a pseudo-metric on X if the following properties are fulfilled:

1. $d(x, y) = 0 \iff x = y$
2. $d(x, y) = d(y, x), \quad \forall x, y \in X$
3. there is a constant C_d such that $\forall x, y, z \in X$,

$$d(x, z) \leq C_d(d(x, y) + d(y, z)).$$

Note that $C_d \geq 1$.

Given any ball $B(x, kR)$, $x \in X$ and $0 < R \leq kR$, denote by $N(x, R, k)$ the maximum number of points in $B(x, kR)$ separated by a distance greater than or equal to R from each other.

Definition 1 *We will say that $(X, d) \in \Upsilon_\gamma$ if there exists $C(\gamma) = C(X, d, \gamma)$ such that, for $kR \leq 1$,*

$$N(x, R, k) \leq C(\gamma)k^\gamma. \qquad (\Upsilon_\gamma)$$

Then we define the upper dimension $\Upsilon(X)$ as

$$\Upsilon(X) = \inf\{\gamma,\ (X, d) \in \Upsilon_\gamma\}.$$

This dimension was first defined by Larman ([Lar,67]) under the name of uniform metric dimension.

Definition 2 *We will say that a probability measure μ lies in $U_\gamma = U_\gamma(X, d)$ if there exists $C(\gamma)$ such that, for $x \in X$ and $0 < R \leq kR \leq 1$,*

$$\mu(B(x, kR)) \leq Ck^\gamma \mu(B(x, R)) \qquad (U_\gamma)$$

Then we define the dimension $U(X)$ as

$$U(X) = \inf\{\gamma,\ U_\gamma(X, d) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Note that by taking $k = 1/R$ in (U_γ) one gets the weaker condition

$$\mu(B(x,R)) \geq CR^\gamma, \qquad x \in X, \quad 0 < R \leq 1. \tag{U'_γ}$$

Also note that if $\mu \in U_\gamma$, for some γ, then $\mathrm{supp}\mu = X$. As mentioned in the introduction, μ is doubling precisely when $\mu \in U_\gamma$ for some $\gamma < \infty$. We will write $\mathcal{U} = \cup_\gamma U_\gamma$ for the set of all doubling measures on X.

Volberg and Konyagin in [V-K,88] proved that $\Upsilon(X) \leq U(X)$. Furthermore they proved:

Theorem 1 (Volberg-Konyagin) *Let (X,d) be a compact complete metric space. If $(X,d) \in \Upsilon_\gamma$ then for every $\gamma' > \gamma$ there exists a measure $\mu \in U_{\gamma'}$. Consequently, $\Upsilon(X,d) = U(X,d)$.*

We will prove, as a part of Theorem 2 below, that this holds for a pseudometric space as well. Furthermore, Theorem 2 contains the corresponding result on the lower dimension, too, and we now proceed to state the definitions in connection with this.

The lower dimension of a set

Definition 3 *We will say that $(X,d) \in \Lambda_\gamma$ if there exists $C(\gamma) = C(X,d,\gamma)$ such that, for $x \in X$ and $0 < R \leq kR \leq 1$,*

$$N(x,R,k) \geq C(\gamma)k^\gamma. \tag{Λ_γ}$$

Then we define the lower dimension $\Lambda(X)$ as:

$$\Lambda(X) = \sup\{\gamma,\ (X,d) \in \Lambda_\gamma\}.$$

This dimension was first defined by Larman ([Lar,67]) under the name of minimal dimension. Note that $(X,d) \in \Lambda_0$ is trivial.

Definition 4 *We will say that a probability measure μ belongs to $L_\gamma = L_\gamma(X,d)$ if there exists $C(\gamma)$ such that, for $x \in X$ and $0 < R \leq kR \leq 1$,*

$$\mu(B(x,kR)) \geq Ck^\gamma \mu(B(x,R)). \tag{L_γ}$$

As before, by taking $k = 1/R$ in (L_γ) one gets the weaker condition

$$\mu(B(x,R)) \leq CR^\gamma \qquad x \in X, \quad 0 < R \leq 1. \tag{L'_γ}$$

Now, observe that the definition

$$L(X) = \sup\{\gamma,\ L_\gamma(X,d) \neq \emptyset\},$$

will not work. The problem is that L_γ does not imply $\operatorname{supp}(\mu) = X$, so this will say nothing about $X \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\mu)$. To overcome this problem we make the following definition.

Definition 5 *We define the dimension $L(X)$ as:*

$$L(X) = \sup\{\gamma,\ L_\gamma(X,d) \cap \mathcal{U} \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Note that L_0 poses no restriction on $\mu \in \mathcal{U}$.

The main theorem

We now state the main result of this paper. Note that in the special case when $t = 0$, we can take $t' = t = 0$.

Theorem 2 *Let $(X,d) \in \Upsilon_s \cap \Lambda_t$, $0 \leq t \leq s < +\infty$, be a compact complete pseudo-metric space. Then for any $s' > s$ and $t' < t$ there exists a probability measure $\mu \in U_{s'} \cap L_{t'}$.*

From Theorem 2 and Propositions 4 and 5 below we then get

Corollary 3 *If $\Upsilon(X) < +\infty$, then $\Upsilon(X) = U(X)$ and $\Lambda(X) = L(X)$.*

3 Proof of the theorem

In what follows $X = (X,d)$ denotes an arbitrary compact complete pseudo-metric space. To prove Theorem 2 we will build a sequence of measures with certain properties and the measure μ will be a limit point of this sequence. We start by proving the trivial inequalities $\Upsilon(X) \leq U(X)$ and $\Lambda(X) \geq L(X)$.

3.1 The trivial inequalities

Proposition 4 *If $\mu \in U_\gamma(X,d)$, then $X \in \Upsilon_\gamma$, i.e. $\Upsilon(X) \leq U(X)$.*

Proof: Let $\mu \in U_\gamma$, fix any $x_0 \in X$ and let $x_1, \ldots, x_N$ be points in $B(x, kR)$ with $d(x_i, x_j) \geq R$ for $i \neq j$. Since $\mu \in U_\gamma$ and $B(x_0, 2C_d kR) \subset B(x_i, 4C_d^2 kR)$,

$$\mu(B(x_0, 2C_d kR)) \leq \mu(B(x_i, 4C_d^2 kR)) \leq C8^\gamma C_d^{3\gamma} k^\gamma \mu(B(x_i, \frac{R}{2C_d})),$$

Also, the (open) balls $B(x_i, R/(2C_d))$ are disjoint and lie in $B(x_0, 2C_d kR)$, so

$$\mu(B(x_0, 2C_d kR)) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu(B(x_i, \frac{R}{2C_d})) \geq N \frac{\mu(B(x_0, 2C_d kR))}{C8^\gamma C_d^{3\gamma} k^\gamma},$$

Thus $N \leq C(\gamma, C_d)k^\gamma$, i.e. $\Upsilon(X) \leq U(X)$. ♣

Proposition 5 *If $\mu \in L_\gamma \cap \mathcal{U}$, then $(X,d) \in \Lambda_\gamma$, i.e. $\Lambda(X) \leq L(X)$.*

Proof: Let $\{x_1, \ldots, x_N\}$ be a maximal set of points in $B(x_0, kR)$ separated by a distance greater than or equal to R. Fix any $\mu \in L_\gamma \cap \mathcal{U}$. Then, since μ is doubling and $B(x_i, kR) \subset B(x_0, 2C_d kR)$ for all i,

$$C_1 \mu(B(x_0, kR)) \geq \mu(B(x_0, 2C_d kR)) \geq \mu(B(x_i, kR)) \geq Ck^\gamma \mu(B(x_i, R)).$$

Also, since $\{x_1, \ldots, x_N\}$ is maximal, $B(x_0, kR) \subset \cup_{i=1}^N B(x_i, R)$,

$$\mu(B(x_0, kR)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu(B(x_i, R)) \leq \frac{N}{Ck^\gamma} \mu(B(x_0, kR))$$

Thus, $N \geq Ck^\gamma$, i.e. $(X,d) \in \Lambda_\gamma$. ♣

3.2 The main lemma

Assume that $X = (X,d) \in \Lambda_t \cap \Upsilon_s$, and without loss of generality suppose that $\mathrm{diam}(X) < 1$. Let C_d be the constant associated to the pseudo-metric d, C_t the constant appearing in Λ_t and C_s the one in Υ_s. Given $t' < t$ and $s' > s$, choose $A \geq 16C_d^4$ large enough such that $A^{s'-s} > C_s$ and $A^{t-t'} > 4^t C_d^{2t} C_t^{-1}$. For each non-negative integer j, let S_j be a maximal set of points in X

separated by a distance greater than or equal to A^{-j}. In particular this means that S_0 consists of just one point.

We define projections $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_m : S_{m+1} \to S_m$ for $m \geq 0$ as follows. For $g \in S_{m+1}$ choose one of the points $e \in S_m$ for which $d(g, e) = d(g, S_m)$, and denote it by $e = \mathcal{E}(g)$. Then for $e \in S_m$ let

$$S_{e,m+1} = \{g \in S_{m+1},\ e = \mathcal{E}(g)\}.$$

It is easy to see that $\{S_{e,m+1},\ e \in S_m\}$ is a partition of S_{m+1}.

The following proposition is a key to the proof of Lemma 7 below. The proposition gives us estimates on the number of points in $S_{e,m+1}$.

Proposition 6 *Let $e \in S_m$. then*

$$A^{t'} \leq \#(S_{e,m+1}) \leq A^{s'},$$

where # denotes the cardinality of a set.

Proof: Fix any $e \in S_m$. Clearly $S_{e,m+1} \subset B(e, A^{-m})$ since S_m is maximal. Therefore, and since $X \in \Upsilon_s$ and $A^{s'-s} > C_s$,

$$\#(S_{e,m+1}) \leq \#(S_{m+1} \cap B(e, A^{-m})) \leq N(e, A^{-m-1}, A) \leq C_s A^s \leq A^{s'},$$

which proves the right inequality of the proposition.

For the left inequality, we first note that there exists $g \in S_{m+1}$ for which $d(g, e) < A^{-m-1}$, and as $A > 2C_d$ it is clear that $e = \mathcal{E}(g)$ for such g. Also, for $e' \neq e''$ we have $B(e', A^{-m}/(2C_d)) \cap B(e'', A^{-m}/(2C_d)) = \emptyset$. Thus,

$$S_{m+1} \cap B(e, A^{-m}/(2C_d)) \subset S_{e,m+1}$$

Next, for $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^n = S_{m+1} \cap B(e, A^{-m}/(2C_d))$ we have

$$n \geq N(e, A^{-m-1}, \frac{A}{2C_d^2} - 1)$$

To check it, suppose the contrary, that is, suppose that

$$n < N(e, A^{-m-1}, \frac{A}{2C_d^2} - 1) = n_1.$$

Then there would exist points $x_1, \ldots, x_{n_1}$ in $B(e, (A/(2C_d^2) - 1)A^{-m-1})$ separated from each other by a distance greater than or equal to A^{-m-1}.

But, for $g \in S_{m+1} \setminus (S_{m+1} \cap B(e, A^{-m}/(2C_d)))$ we have

$$d(g, x_i) \geq \frac{1}{C_d} d(g, e) - d(e, x_i) \geq \frac{A}{2C_d^2} A^{-m-1} - \left(\frac{A}{2C_d^2} - 1 \right) A^{-m-1} = A^{-m-1},$$

which means that the set

$$S'_{m+1} = (\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{n_1} \cup S_{m+1}) \setminus (S_{m+1} \cap B(e, \frac{A}{2C_d} A^{-m-1}))$$

fulfils $\#(S'_{m+1}) > \#(S_{m+1})$, a contradiction to the maximality of S_{m+1}.

Thus, from 3.2, 3.2, the choice of A and the fact that $X \in \Lambda_t$, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \#(S_{e,m+1}) &\geq \#(S_{m+1} \cap B(e, A^{-m}/(2C_d))) \geq N(e, A^{-m-1}, \frac{A}{2C_d^2} - 1) \geq \\ &\geq C_t \left(\frac{A}{2C_d^2} - 1 \right)^t \geq C_t A^t (4C_d^2)^{-t} \geq A^{t'} \end{aligned}$$

♣

Lemma 7 *Let f_0 be a measure on S_m such that for any $e, e' \in S_m$ we have*

$$f_0(e') \leq C_1 f_0(e)$$

whenever $d(e, e') \leq C_2 A^{-m}$, with $C_1 = A^{s'-t'}$, and $C_2 = 8C_d^3$. Then there is a measure f_1 on S_{m+1} with the following properties:

- **(a)** *$f_1(g') \leq C_1 f_1(g)$ for any $g, g' \in S_{m+1}$ with $d(g, g') \leq C_2 A^{-m-1}$.*
- **(b)** *If $g \in S_{e,m+1}$, then $A^{-s'} f_0(e) \leq f_1(g) \leq A^{-t'} f_0(e)$.*
- **(c)** *$f_0(X) = f_1(X)$.*
- **(d)** *The construction of the measure f_1 from the measure f_0 can be regarded as a transfer of mass from the points in S_m to those of S_{m+1}, with no mass transferred over a distance greater than $2C_d A^{-m}$. This means that if $g \in S_{m+1}$ recieves mass from $e \in S_m$, then $d(g, e) \leq 2C_d A^{-m}$.*

Proof of the lemma: Let f_{00} be the measure obtained by homogeneously distributing the mass of each $e \in S_m$ on the points in $S_{e,m+1}$. By doing so, we obtain a measure satisfying **(b)** (because of Proposition 6), **(c)** and **(d)**. If f_{00} satisfies **(a)**, then let $f_1 = f_{00}$ and we are done.

Assume that f_{00} does not satisfy **(a)**. Let $\{g_i', g_i''\}_{i=1}^T$ be all the pairs of points in S_{m+1} with $d(g_i', g_i'') \leq C_2 A^{-m-1}$. We will construct a finite sequence of measures $\{f_{0j},\, j = 1, \ldots, T\}$, such that f_{0j} will satisfy **(a)** for all the pairs $\{(g_i', g_i'')\}_{i=1}^j$, and as we will see $f_1 = f_{0T}$ is the desired measure.

The construction of f_{0j+1} from f_{0j} is as follows:

If $C_1^{-1} f_{0j}(g_{j+1}'') \leq f_{0j}(g_{j+1}') \leq C_1 f_{0j}(g_{j+1}'')$, then let $f_{0j+1} = f_{0j}$. Otherwise, only one of these inequalities can fail, and without loss of generality we may assume that $f_{0j}(g_{j+1}') > C_1 f_{0j}(g_{j+1}'')$. Then we move mass from g_{j+1}' to g_{j+1}'' by defining f_{0j+1} as

$$\begin{aligned} f_{0j+1}(g_{j+1}') &= f_{0j}(g_{j+1}') - \frac{f_{0j}(g_{j+1}') - C_1 f_{0j}(g_{j+1}'')}{C_1 + 1}; \\ f_{0j+1}(g_{j+1}'') &= f_{0j}(g_{j+1}'') + \frac{f_{0j}(g_{j+1}') - C_1 f_{0j}(g_{j+1}'')}{C_1 + 1}; \\ f_{0j+1}(g) &= f_{0j}(g) \qquad \text{if } g \notin \{g_{j+1}',\, g_{j+1}''\}. \end{aligned}$$

With this definition $f_{0j+1}(g_{j+1}') = C_1 f_{0j+1}(g_{j+1}'')$, which means that **(a)** is true for f_{0j+1} with respect to (g_{j+1}', g_{j+1}''). In particular, note that **(a)** is true for f_{01} with respect to (g_1', g_1'').

We are now going to check condition **(b)** for f_{0j+1}. To do so, suppose that **(b)** holds for f_{0j}, i.e. suppose that

$$A^{-s'} f_0(e) \leq f_1(g) \leq A^{-t'} f_0(e), \quad g \in S_{e,m+1}.$$

If $f_{0j+1} = f_{0j}$ or $g \notin \{g_{j+1}', g_{j+1}''\}$, then there is nothing to check. Otherwise, as before we can assume that $f_{0j}(g_{j+1}') > C_1 f_{0j}(g_{j+1}'')$. Let $e' = \mathcal{E}(g_{j+1}')$ and $e'' = \mathcal{E}(g_{j+1}'')$. It is clearly enough to prove that $f_{0j+1}(g_{j+1}') \geq A^{-s'} f_0(e')$ and $f_{0j+1}(g_{j+1}'') \leq A^{-t'} f_0(e'')$ (because $f_{0j+1}(g_{j+1}') < f_{0j}(g_{j+1}') \leq A^{-t'} f_0(e')$ and $f_{0j+1}(g_{j+1}'') > f_{0j}(g_{j+1}'') \geq A^{-s'} f_0(e'')$). Now

$$\begin{aligned} d(e', e'') &\leq C_d d(e', g_{j+1}') + C_d^2 d(g_{j+1}', g_{j+1}'') + C_d^2 d(g_{j+1}'', e'') \leq \\ &\leq C_d A^{-m} + C_2 C_d^2 A^{-m-1} + C_d^2 A^{-m} \leq C_2 A^{-m}, \end{aligned}$$

so $f_0(e') \leq C_1 f_0(e'')$. Therefore

$$f_{0j+1}(g''_{j+1}) = C_1^{-1} f_{0j+1}(g'_{j+1}) \leq C_1^{-1} f_{0j}(g'_{j+1}) \leq C_1^{-1} A^{-t'} f_0(e') \leq A^{-t'} f_0(e'').$$

Analogously, $f_0(e'') \geq C_1^{-1} f_0(e')$. Thus,

$$f_{0j+1}(g'_{j+1}) = C_1 f_{0j+1}(g''_{j+1}) \geq C_1 f_{0j}(g''_{j+1}) \geq C_1 A^{-s'} f_0(e'') \geq A^{-s'} f_0(e').$$

Consequently, since **(b)** holds for f_{00} according to Proposition 6 it is then clear that it holds for $f_1 = f_{0T}$ as well.

We are now going to check that when a pair satisfies **(a)** with respect to f_{0j}, it also does with respect to f_{0j+1}. To this end, pick any pair (g_1, g_2), $d(g_1, g_2) \leq C_2 A^{-m-1}$, for which

$$C_1^{-1} f_{0j}(g_1) \leq f_{0j}(g_2) \leq C_1 f_{0j}(g_1).$$

If (g_1, g_2) and (g'_{j+1}, g''_{j+1}) have no point in common or if $f_{0j+1} = f_{0j}$, then we are done. Otherwise, $f_{0j+1} \neq f_{0j}$ and $f_{0j}(g'_{j+1}) > C_1 f_{0j}(g''_{j+1})$. Then the two pairs have only one point in common, say g_1. In this case $f_{0j+1}(g_2) = f_{0j}(g_2)$. We have two possible cases to consider, either $g_1 = g'_{j+1}$ or $g_1 = g''_{j+1}$:

If $g_1 = g''_{j+1}$, then $f_{0j+1}(g_1) > f_{0j}(g_1)$, so in this case it is enough to prove that $f_{0j+1}(g_1) \leq C_1 f_{0j+1}(g_2)$. If $e' = \mathcal{E}(g'_{j+1})$ and $e_2 = \mathcal{E}(g_2)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} d(e', e_2) \quad &\leq C_d d(e', g'_{j+1}) + C_d^3 d(g'_{j+1}, g_1) + C_d^3 d(g_1, g_2) + C_d^2 d(g_2, e_2) \leq \\ &\leq C_d A^{-m} + 2C_d^3 C_2 A^{-m-1} + C_d^2 A^{-m} \leq C_2 A^{-m}, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

so $f_0(e') \leq C_1 f_0(e_2)$. Also, since we already know that **(b)** is true, we have $f_0(e_2) \leq A^{s'} f_{0j+1}(g_2)$ and $f_{0j+1}(g'_{j+1}) \leq A^{-t'} f_0(e')$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{0j+1}(g_1) \quad &= \quad f_{0j+1}(g''_{j+1}) = C_1^{-1} f_{0j+1}(g'_{j+1}) \leq C_1^{-1} A^{-t'} f_0(e') \leq \\ &\leq \quad A^{-t'} f_0(e_2) \leq A^{s'-t'} f_{0j}(g_2) = A^{s'-t'} f_{0j+1}(g_2) = C_1 f_{0j+1}(g_2) \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, if $g_1 = g'_{j+1}$, then $f_{0j+1}(g_1) < f_{0j}(g_1)$, and it is enough to check that $f_{0j+1}(g_1) \geq C_1^{-1} f_{0j+1}(g_2)$. But, for $e'' = \mathcal{E}(g''_{j+1})$, then as in 4 $d(e'', e_2) \leq C_2 A^{-m}$. Also, $f_{0j+1}(g_1) = C_1 f_{0j+1}(g''_{j+1})$. Thus, from **(b)** we then get

$$\begin{aligned} f_{0j+1}(g_1) \quad &= \quad C_1 f_{0j+1}(g''_{j+1}) \geq C_1 A^{-s'} f_0(e'') \geq A^{-s'} f_0(e_2) \geq \\ &\geq \quad A^{t'-s'} f_{0j+1}(g_2) = C_1^{-1} f_{0j+1}(g_2). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof that **(a)** is true for f_1.

Clearly $f_{0j+1}(X) = f_{0j}(X)$, so **(c)** is also true for f_1.

It remains to check **(d)**. When passing from f_0 to f_{00} no mass is moved over a distance exceeding A^{-m}, because $S_{e,m+1} \subset B(e, A^{-m})$, and when going from f_{0j} to f_{0j+1} no mass is moved over a distance exceeding $C_2 A^{-m-1}$, and $C_2/A < 1$. It therefore remains to prove that in the construction of f_1 from f_0 there are no pairs (g_1, g_2) and (g_2, g_3) in S_{m+1} for which mass is first moved from g_1 to g_2 and then at a subsequent step from g_2 to g_3. To prove this, assume the opposite. Then

$$f_{00}(g_1) > C_1 f_{00}(g_2) \qquad \text{and} \qquad f_{00}(g_2) > C_1 f_{00}(g_3).$$

But, if $e_1 = \mathcal{E}(g_1)$ and $e_3 = \mathcal{E}(g_3)$, then as in 4, $d(e_1, e_3) \leq C_2 A^{-m}$, so by the hypothesis $C_1^{-1} f_0(e_1) \leq f_0(e_3) \leq C_1 f_0(e_1)$. Also,

$$A^{-s'} f_0(e_i) \leq f_{00}(g_i) \leq A^{-t'} f_0(e_i),$$

for $i = 1$ and $i = 3$. Adding these two inequalities, we would then get

$$f_0(e_1) \geq A^{t'} f_{00}(g_1) > C_1 A^{t'} f_{00}(g_2) > C_1^2 A^{t'} f_{00}(g_3) \geq C_1^2 A^{t'-s'} f_0(e_3),$$

contradicting $f_0(e_1) \leq C_1 f_0(e_3)$, as $d(e_1, e_3) \leq C_2 A^{-m}$ and $C_1 = A^{s'-t'}$. ♣

3.3 Proof of the theorem

We will use Lemma 7 to construct a sequence of probability measures and, as we will see, any limit point of this sequence will satisfy $L_{t'}$ and $U_{s'}$.

We start by defining a probability measure μ_0 on S_0 (note that S_0 consists of one point only, by the assumption $\operatorname{diam}(X) < 1$). Obviously μ_0 satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 7. For every non-integer j we then use Lemma 7 to construct a probability measure $\mu_{j+1} = f_1$ on S_{j+1} from $\mu_j = f_0$. In this way we get a sequence $\{\mu_j\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$ of probability measures. This sequence lies in the unit ball of the dual of the Banach space $\mathcal{C}(X)$, and thus has at least one weak limit point. Let μ be any limit point of this sequence. In the proof of the theorem we will frequently use the following proposition, based on **(d)** of Lemma 7.

Proposition 8 *Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $r \geq 0$ and $x \in X$. Letting $C_4 = 2C_d^2/(1 - C_d/A)$ we then have*

$$\mu_j(B(x,r)) \leq \mu(B(x, r + C_4 A^{-j}))$$

and

$$\mu(B(x,r)) \leq \mu_j(B(x, r + C_4 A^{-j})).$$

Proof: According to **(d)** of Lemma 7 no mass is moved at a distance exceeding $2C_d A^{-j}$ when constructing μ_{j+1} from μ_j. Thus, when passing from μ_j to μ_{j+k}, $k \geq 1$, no mass is moved at a distance exceeding

$$2C_d^2 A^{-j} \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} (C_d/A)^n < \frac{2C_d^2}{1 - C_d/A} A^{-j} = C_4 A^{-j},$$

which means that there is no mass transfer from $B(x,r)$ into the complement of $B(x, r + C_4 A^{-j})$, and vice versa. Thus,

$$\mu_j(B(x,R)) \leq \mu_{j+k}(B(x, r + C_4 A^{-j}))$$

and

$$\mu_{j+k}(B(x,r)) \leq \mu_j(B(x, r + C_4 A^{-j})).$$

Now, as μ is a weak limit point of $\{\mu_{j+k}\}$, the same is true for μ as well. ♣

We are now going to prove that $\mu \in L_{t'} \cap U_{s'}$. To this end, we first pick an $x \in X$, and then some R and k for which $0 < R \leq kR \leq 1$. Next we choose integers m and M such that

$$kR \leq A^{-m} < AkR \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{R}{A} \leq A^{-M} < R. \tag{5}$$

We then denote by e_{M+1} one of the points in S_{M+1} closest to x (there may be several), and recursively we define $e_{M-j} = \mathcal{E}(e_{M-j+1}) \in S_{M-j}$ for $j = 0, \ldots, M - m$.

First claim:

$$\mu_{m+2}(e_{m+2}) \leq \mu(B(x,kR)) \leq C_s 3^{s'} (1 + C_4)^s C_1 \mu_m(e_m). \tag{6}$$

Proof: To prove this first claim, first note that, by Proposition 8,

$$\mu_{m+2}(e_{m+2}) \leq \mu(B(e_{m+2}, C_4 A^{-m-2})).$$

On the other hand,

$$d(x, e_{m+2}) \leq C_d A^{-m-2} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (C_d/A)^j = \frac{C_d}{1 - C_d/A} A^{-m-2}.$$

Let $y \in B(e_{m+2}, C_4 A^{-m-2})$. Then, by 5,

$$d(y, x) \leq C_d C_4 A^{-m-2} + \frac{C_d^2}{1 - C_d/A} A^{-m-2} \leq A^{-m-1} < kR,$$

i.e. $B(e_{m+2}, C_4 A^{-m-2}) \subset B(x, kR)$. From Proposition 8 we then get

$$\mu_{m+2}(e_{m+2}) \leq \mu(B(e_{m+2}, C_4 A^{-m-2})) \leq \mu(B(x, kR))$$

proving the first inequality in 6. To prove the second inequality, note that 5 and Proposition 8 imply

$$\mu(B(x, kR)) \leq \mu_m(B(x, kR + C_4 A^{-m})) \leq \mu_m(B(x, (1 + C_4) A^{-m})).$$

But, $d(x, e_m) \leq \frac{C_d}{1 - C_d/A} A^{-m}$. Thus, if $e \in S_m \cap B(x, (1 + C_4) A^{-m})$, then

$$d(e, e_m) \leq C_d (1 + C_4) A^{-m} + \frac{C_d^2}{1 - C_d/A} A^{-m} \leq C_2 A^{-m},$$

so from Lemma 7 it follows that $\mu_m(e) \leq C_1 \mu_m(e_m)$. Now,

$$\# \left(S_m \cap B(x, (1 + C_4) A^{-m}) \right) \leq C_s (1 + C_4)^s,$$

so from Proposition 8 and the fact that $kR \leq A^{-m}$, we get

$$\mu(B(x, kR)) \leq \mu_m(B(x, (1 + C_4) A^{-m})) \leq C_s (1 + C_4)^s C_1 \mu_m(e_{x,m}),$$

which concludes the proof of the first claim.

Second claim:

$$\mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1}) \leq \mu(B(x, R)) \leq C_s (1 + C_4)^{s'} A^{2s'} C_1 \mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1}). \qquad (7)$$

Proof: According to Proposition 8,

$$\mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1}) \leq \mu(B(e_{M+1}, C_4 A^{-M-1})).$$

Also, $d(e_{M+1}, x) = d(x, S_{M+1}) \leq A^{-M-1} < R/A$, by the definition of e_{M+1}. Thus, for $y \in B(e_{x,M+1}, C_4 A^{-M-1})$,

$$d(y, x) \leq C_d C_4 A^{-M-1} + C_d A^{-M-1} \leq A^{-M} < R.$$

Again by Proposition 8,

$$\mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1}) \leq \mu(B(e_{M+1}, C_4 A^{-M-1})) \leq \mu(B(x, R)),$$

proving the left inequality in 7. To prove the right inequality, note that from Proposition 8 and the fact that $R \leq A^{-M+1}$, by the choice of M,

$$\mu(B(x, R)) \leq \mu_{M-1}(B(x, R + C_4 A^{-M+1})) \leq \mu_{M-1}(B(x, (1 + C_4) A^{-M+1})).$$

Also, for $g \in B(x, R + C_4 A^{-M+1}) \cap S_{M-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(g, e_{M-1}) &\leq C_d d(g, x) + C_d^3 d(x, e_{M+1}) + C_d^3 d(e_{M+1}, e_M) + C_d^2 d(e_M, e_{M-1}) \\ &\leq C_d (1 + C_4) A^{-M+1} + C_d^3 A^{-M-1} + C_d^3 A^{-M} + C_d^2 A^{-M+1} \leq C_2 A^{-M+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, from **(a)** and **(b)** of Lemma 7 we get (recalling $e_{M-j} = \mathcal{E}(e_{M-j+1})$,

$$\mu_{M-1}(g) \leq C_1 \mu_{M-1}(e_{M-1}) \leq C_1 A^{2s'} \mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1}).$$

But,

$$\# \left(B(x, (1 + C_4) A^{-M+1}) \cap S_{M-1} \right) \leq C_s (1 + C_4)^s,$$

so

$$\mu(B(x, R)) \leq \mu_{M-1}(B(x, (1 + C_4) A^{-M+1})) \leq C_s (1 + C_4)^s A^{2s'} C_1 \mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1}),$$

proving the second claim.

To conclude the proof, note that $\mu(e_m) \leq A^{s'(M+1-m)} \mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1})$ and $\mu_{m+2}(e_{m+2}) \geq A^{t'(M-m-1)} \mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1})$, by **(b)** in Lemma 7. Also note that $k < A^{M-m} \leq A^2 k$, by the choice of m and M. Thus, from the two claims it follows that

$$\mu(B(x, kR)) \leq C \mu_m(e_m) \leq C A^{s'(M-m)} \mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1}) \leq C k^{s'} \mu(B(x, R)),$$

and similarly,

$$\mu(B(x, kR)) \geq \mu_{m+2}(e_{m+2}) \geq C A^{t'(M-m)} \mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1}) \geq C k^{t'} \mu(B(x, R)),$$

i.e. $\mu \in \Lambda_{t'} \cap \Upsilon_{s'}$.

Note that the final constants C depend only on the given constants C_d, C_s, C_t and the choice of A, s' and t'. Also note that the last inequality depends on the fact that $\Upsilon(X) < +\infty$. ♣

4 Examples

Denoting by $\dim(E)$ the Hausdorff dimension of E, Larman ([Lar,67]) proved that $\Lambda(E) \leq \dim(E) \leq \Upsilon(E)$ for any metric space $E = (E, d)$.

We consider some examples of Cantor type sets in the Euclidean metric.

When E is the usual s-dimensional Cantor set the dimensions coincide, $\Lambda(E) = \dim(E) = \Upsilon(E)$ (since $H^s(B(x,r)) \approx r^s$ for the s-dimensional Hausdorff measure H^s).

Now, denote by C_t the t-dimensional Cantor set contained in $[0,1]$ and by C_s the s-dimensional Cantor set in $[2,3]$, and suppose that $0 < t < s < 1$. Then $E = C_t \cup C_s$ has lower dimension $t = \Lambda(E) = \dim(C_t) < \dim(E)$ and upper dimension $s = \Upsilon(E) = \dim(C_s) = \dim(E)$ (which follows from the fact that $\mu(E) = H^t(C_t) + H^s(C_s) \in U_s \cap L_t$, i.e $t \leq \Lambda(E) \leq \Upsilon(E) \leq s$, and also, $s = \dim(E) \leq \Upsilon(E)$ and $t = \Lambda(C_t) \geq \Lambda(E)$).

Next we consider the case when two Cantor sets intersect at the end-points. Let C_1 be the $\log 2/\log 3$-dimensional Cantor set in $[0,1]$ and C_2 the $\log 2/\log 9$-dimensional Cantor set in $[1,2]$ (i.e. obtained by indefinitely deleting $7/9$ from the middle of each sub-interval starting with $[1,2]$). It is clear C_1 and C_2 are closed, and that $C_1 \cap C_2 = \{1\}$. Put $F = C_1 \cup C_2$. Then F is closed, and it is easy to see that F has lower dimension $\Lambda(F) = \log 2/\log 9$ and upper dimension $\Upsilon(F) = \log 2/\log 3$. Thus, it follows from Theorem 2 that there exists $\mu \in L_t \cup U_s$ on F for every $t < \log 2/\log 9$ and $s > \log 2/\log 3$. Furthermore, there is a $\mu_n \in L_{\log 2/\log 9} \cup U_{s_n}$ on F with $\log 2/\log 3 < s_n < \log 2/\log 3 + 1/n$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. To see this, choose the constant A in Theorem 2 on the form $A = 9^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the corresponding maximal 9^{-mn}-sets S_m turns out to be uniquely determined and $2^n \leq \#S_{e,m+1} \leq 4^n + 2^n - 1$ for all e and m (namely $\#S_{e,m+1} = 4^n$ for $e \in [0,1)$, $\#S_{e,m+1} = 4^n + 2^n - 1$ for $e = 1$, and $\#S_{e,m+1} = 2^n$ for $e \in (1,2]$). This bound on $\#S_{e,m+1}$ imply that there is a measure $\mu_n \in L_{\log 2/\log 9} \cup U_{s_n}$ on F, with $s_n = \log(4^n + 2^n - 1)/\log 9^n < \log 2/\log 3 + 1/n$.

Similarly, there is a measure $\mu \in L_t \cap U_{\log 2/\log 3}$ on F for some $t < \frac{\log 2}{\log 9}$. Let ν_1 be any $\log 2/\log 3$-measure on C_1 and ν_2 any $\log 2/\log 9$-measure on C_2. Then one can easily see that the measure $\nu = \nu_1 + \nu_2$ is not even doubling on F (because of the density jump at $\{1\}$). But, it is possible to construct a measure μ_2 on C_2 such that $\mu = \nu_1 + \mu_2$ becomes a measure on F belonging to $L_t \cap U_{\log 2/\log 3}$ for some $t < \log 2/\log 9$ (for details, see [Byl,94], Part C, Ex. 2).

We do not know whether there exists a $\mu \in L_{\log 2/\log 9} \cap U_{\log 2/\log 3}$ on F.

It is important to notice that the measure we construct in the proof of the theorem 2 is not unique. This was already noticed by Volberg and Konyagin ([V-K,88]) and in fact, as proved in [K-W,95], in any closed perfect set there are at least two mutually singular doubling measures, and as they are doubling both of them must lie in some U_γ.

However, in spite of this, one can show that Besov spaces defined with respect to different such measures are equivalent (see [Byl,94], Part B).

References

[Byl,94] Per Bylund, *Besov spaces and measures on arbitrary closed sets*, doctoral dissertation, University of Umeå.

[Dyn,84] E. M. Dynkin, *Free interpolation by functions with derivatives in* H^1, J. Soviet Math. **27** (1984), 2475-2481.

[Gud,97] Jaume Gudayol, *Boundary behaviour of functions in Hardy-Sobolev spaces*, doctoral dissertation, Universitat de Barcelona, 1997.

[Jon,94] Alf Jonsson, *Besov spaces on closed subsets of* $\mathbb{R}^n$, Transactions of the AMS **41** (1994), no. 1, 355-370.

[J-W,84] Alf Jonsson and Hans Wallin, *Function spaces on subsets of* $\mathbb{R}^n$, Math. Reports Volume 2, Part 1, Harwood Academics Publ. GmbH, 1984.

[K-W,95] Robert Kaufman and Jang-Mei Wu, *Two problems in doubling measures*, Revista Matemática Iberoamericana **11** (1995), 527-545.

[Lar,67] D.G. Larman, *A new theory of dimension*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3rd series) **17** (1967), 178-192.

[V-K,88] A.L. Vol'berg and S.V. Konyagin, *On measures with the doubling condition*, Math. USSR Izvestiya **30** (1988), 629-638.